

STATE OF MISSOURI, et al.,)
)
 Plaintiffs,)
)
 v.) No. 4:19-CV-2135 HEA
)
 RICARDO MORALES et al.,)
)
)
 Defendants.)

This matter is before the Court on defendants’ post-dismissal motion to “Stay Case Pending Appeal on Claims This Court is Biased, Prejudiced, Hateful and Disrespectful to the Administration of Justice and Should Have Recused Himself.” It appears defendants are seeking reconsideration of their August 9, 2019, request for this Court to recuse itself from this action.

In practice, the standard requires a showing that “the judge had a disposition so extreme as to display clear inability to render fair judgment.” *Id.* (citation and internal marks omitted). “A party introducing a motion to recuse carries a heavy burden of proof; a judge is presumed to be impartial and the party seeking disqualification bears the substantial burden of proving

otherwise.” *Fletcher v. Conoco Pipe line Co.*, 323 F.3d 661, 664 (8th Cir. 2003) (citation omitted).

Neither defendants’ August 9, 2019 motion, nor the present motion before the Court introduce any factual assertions that reasonably question the Court’s impartiality.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendants’ motion to stay case and recuse the undersigned [Doc. #9] is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that an appeal from this dismissal would not be taken in good faith.

Dated this 21st day of August, 2019.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Henry Edward Autrey", is written over a horizontal line.

HENRY EDWARD AUTREY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE